



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,443	01/17/2002	Kung Yi Lin	518-L	4096

7590

02/23/2005

ALFRED W. KOZAK  
UNISYS CORPORATION  
10850 VIA FRONTERA, MS 1000  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92127

EXAMINER
----------

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/053,443

Applicant(s)

01/17/2002

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 05/19/2003                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 are represented for the examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **1, 6 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broulik et al (US. Patent 6,323,881 B1) and further in view of Johnson et al (US. Patent 5,237,700).

3. **As to claim 1**, Broulik teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: mainframe server (servers nodes 22 and 24, col 3, ln 47-50), on client (a client browser, col 3, ln 47-50/ Fig. 2), handling a suspended task (col 7, ln 42-47), a security check on said mainframe server (col 5, ln 4-7/ col 7, ln 55-62), response (a session, col 5, ln 1-4), detecting a response from said suspended task (col 5, ln 1-4), handling said response (col 7, ln 40-42), activating said suspended task with said response( col 7, ln 44-47).

4. Broulik does not explicit teach the term monitoring said response. However, Johnson teaches monitoring said response (monitor means 20 is in the process of handling a second level exception condition, col 5, ln 32-34).

Art Unit: 2126

5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Broulik and Johnson because Johnson's monitoring said response would avoid the problems of exception latency.

6. **As to claims 6 and 11**, they are apparatus claims of claim 1; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

7. Claims 2, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broulik et al (US. Patent 6,323,881 B1) in view of Johnson et al (US. Patent 5,237,700) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of David L.Black (The Mach Exception Handling Facility).

8. **As to claim 2**, Broulik and Jonhson do not teach suspended task may have resulted from a program exception. However, David teaches suspended task may have resulted from a program exception (a fatal exception can cause the execution state of a program to be saved for later examination, section 3, ln 12-15).

9. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Broulik, Jonhson and David because David's suspended task may have resulted from a program exception would direct support for debugger attachment without kernel modifications.

10. **As to claim 7**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2126

11. Claims **3, 8 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broulik et al (US. Patent 6,323,881 B1) in view of Johnson et al (US. Patent 5,237,700) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Cromer et al (US. Patent 6,823,464 B2).

12. As to claim **3**, Broulik teaches determining if a database control file exist client has a privilege / permission to access (col 5, ln 4-7/ col 7, ln 55-62/ col 8, ln 1-6).

13. Broulik and Johnson do not explicit teach return an error. However, Cromer teaches return an error (a tamper error is reported, col 2, ln 10-15).

14. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Broulik, Johnson and Cromer because Cromer's return an error would allow a remote entity to change the security data upon correct authentication.

15. As to claims **8 and 12**, they are apparatus claims of claim 3; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

16. Claims **4, 9 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broulik et al (US. Patent 6,323,881 B1) in view of Johnson et al (US. Patent 5,237,700) as applied to claim 1 above and in view of Saulpaugh et al (US. 5,590,334).

17. As to claim **4**, Broulik teaches determining if said response is from said mainframe server, and if so, notifying said client of said response (col 4, ln 58-62), determining if said response is from said client (col 4, ln 52-56).

Art Unit: 2126

18. Broulik and Johnson do not teach canceling said response. However, Saulpaugh teaches canceling said response (deletes port objects 52 in response to a port object deletion request, col 8, ln 55-60).
19. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Broulik, Johnson and Saulpaugh because Saulpaugh's canceling said response would reduce the time required to perform time critical operations for communication between client and server.
20. As to claims 9 and 13, they are apparatus claims of claim 4; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.
21. Claims 5, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broulik et al (US. Patent 6,323,881 B1) in view of Johnson et al (US. Patent 5,237,700) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Ndumu et al (US. Patent 6,314,555 B1).
22. As to claim 5, Broulik teaches an operating system call on said mainframe server to submit said response for said suspended task to said client (col 5, ln 25-30).
23. Broulik and Johnson do not explicit teach sending said response from said client to a service program and from service program to a server program. However, Ndumu teaches response from said client to a service program and from service program to a server program (the mailbox 200 for new incoming message, which it dispatches to other relevant components of the agent for detailed processing, col 8, ln 65-67 to col 9, ln 1-5).

Art Unit: 2126

24. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Broulik, Johnson and Ndumu because Ndumu's response from said client to a service program and from service program to a server program would allocate the tasks amongst a plurality of software modules.

25. As to claims 10 and 14, they are apparatus claims of claim 5; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 5 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100